

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandria, Virgiria 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,170	07/20/2001	Howard Taitel	MWS-041RCE	1865
74211 7590 DJ/12/2009 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000			EXAMINER	
			ALAM, SHAHID AL	
One Post Offic Boston, MA 02		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/12/2000	DADED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Shahid Al Alam. (2) Kevin Canning. (3) Elaine Yang. (4) Date of Interview: 07 January 2009. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 43-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject matter and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not not or at. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, as summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on re				
(1) Shahid Al Alam. (2) Kevin Canning. Date of Interview: 07 January 2009. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference old Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 43-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky 187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed to Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) HE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		Shahid Al Alam	2162	
(2) Kevin Canning. Date of Interview: 07. January 2009. Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conference c) □ Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No. If Yes, brief description: □ □. Claim(s) discussed: 43-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject matter and how to solve them. We discussed the Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. His attached. The interview is the complex of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available. The interview of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available. The interview of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available. The interview of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available. The interview of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available. The interview of the amendment of the amendments that would render the claims	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Date of Interview: 07 January 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 43-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and now they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	(1) <u>Shahid Al Alam</u> .	(3) <u>Elaine Yang</u> .		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 42-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713 04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	(2) <u>Kevin Canning</u> .	(4)		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	Date of Interview: 07 January 2009.			
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 43-51. Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky 729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and now they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	2) applicant's representative	e)	
Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky '729 and Kodosky '187. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arquing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		e) No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant argument that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Claim(s) discussed: <u>43-51</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutory subject matter and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAY'S FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Identification of prior art discussed: Kodosky '729 and Kodo	osky '187.		
reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 USC 101 non-statutor's subject mattler and how to solve them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how they are similar in scope. Applicant arguing that both Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested to submit a petition and/or affidavits. Applicant will submit a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
	reached, or any other comments: We discussed about 35 I them. We discussed two Kodosky references and how the Kodosky references are not prior art. Examiner requested a petition and/or affidavits and response shortly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no coallowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTELLE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTE	JSC 101 non-statutory subject y are similar in scope. Applict to submit a petition and/or affi. ments which the examiner ag oppy of the amendments that with the submit and the submit an	t mattler and how ant arguing that I idavits. Applicant reed would rend- yould render the E SUBSTANCE (been filed, APP / DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	v to solve both t will submit er the claims claims DF THE LICANT IS ILICANT IS LATER, TO